

Amendment Dated April 18, 2005  
Response to Office Action dated January 19, 2005

Application No. 09/868,695

### REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1-18 are rejected by this Office Action.

This Office Action acknowledges the Applicant's claim for priority based on US Application No. 09/218,945 filed on December 22, 1998.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for entering the Schreiner reference cited in the Supplemental IDS.

The Applicant previously filed a preliminary amendment to amend the title to "A Goal Based System, Utilizing a Table Based Architecture".

#### **Claim Objections**

The Applicant is amending claim 10 to amend "the goal for" to "a goal for". The Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by the Office Action as allegedly being obvious over WO 97/44766 A1 (Cook) in view of U.S. 5,257,181 (Farley). Regarding claim 1, the Office Action admits (Page 4.):

Cook et al doesn't explicitly teach (c) managing information flow utilizing a table of components, wherein each component encapsulates behavior and data necessary to support a related set of services while Farley et al teaches, (c) managing information flow (column 25, lines 43-50, "To ensure a ... to the user") utilizing a table (column 29, lines 3-12, "It should be ... of the design") of components (column 5, lines 38-57, "The Administrative Component ... and maintained therein"), wherein each component encapsulates behavior and data necessary to support a related set of services (column 10, lines 9-31, "FIG. 1A is a ... users, including individuals")

However, Farley does not teach or even suggest the feature of "managing information flow utilizing a **table of components**, wherein each component encapsulates behavior and data necessary to support a related set of services." (Emphasis added.) Farley does teach (Col. 5, lines 38-57. Emphasis added.):

The Administrative Component provides system security by defining four specific user types, each having specific access capability with respect to what can be read or written from, or what can be written to, the various files of each system component. Furthermore, the administrative component can control the type of information in the user component that is available to the user who selects a given qualifier code. For example, **the administrative component can include a table**

Amendment Dated April 18, 2005  
Response to Office Action dated January 19, 2005

Application No 09/868,695

to define authorized users, with their associated access and default qualifiers. Another table in the administrative component specifies the system responses to the user as the user navigates through the system, and permits the system manager or his designee to add, change or delete these responses. The administrative component can also include a session maintenance table for specifying the manner in which user sessions are logged, saved, and purged. The placement of all windows, boxes and "push buttons", as well as other user interface symbols and conventions, are defined and maintained therein.

Farley merely teaches a component (i.e., the administrative component) utilizing tables to support various functions of the component. However, Farley does not teach or even suggest utilizing a table of components.

Similarly, claim 10 includes "logic that manages information flow utilizing a table of components, wherein each component encapsulates behavior and data necessary to support a related set of services." Moreover, claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-15, and 17-18 ultimately depend from claims 1 and 10. Thus, claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-15, and 17-18 are patentable for at least the above reasons. The Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-18.

Furthermore, regarding claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-15, and 17-18, the combination of Cook and Farley does not teach or even suggest the feature of "instantiating a component from the table of components to measure progress toward the goal" (as claimed in claim 2 and correspondingly in claim 11) because neither Cook nor Farley teaches anything about a table of components. For example, regarding claim 2, Cook teaches (Page 20, lines 15-28):

Teachers and administrators 106 also interact with materials engine 102 for several purposes, as represented by arrow 107. For example, teachers can customize existing materials by adding additional items, modifying existing items, altering the order of item presentation, changing the notations (see infra.) governing agent interaction, and so forth. A teacher can create particular instances of materials suitable for one class, a group, or even on student. Further, although reporting of student progress preferably occurs by other means, in alternative embodiments the materials engine can directly report student progress to teachers and administrators. For example, this can be done by entering notations that generate messages for the teachers.

The above teaching of Cook does not even suggest anything about tables and does not even suggest the feature of "instantiating a component from the table of components to measure progress toward the goal." Similarly, the combination of Cook and Farley does not even suggest the features of "instantiating a component from the table of components to interrupt and interview the student to obtain information to measure progress toward the goal and determine appropriate feedback" (as claimed in claim 3 and correspondingly in claim 12) and "instantiating

Amendment Dated April 18, 2005  
Response to Office Action dated January 19, 2005

Application No 09/868,695

a component from the table of components to analyze progress and determine appropriate feedback" (as claimed in claim 4 and correspondingly in claim 13). Similarly, the combination of Cook and Farley does not even suggest the features of "instantiating a component from the table of components to evaluate options and present appropriate feedback to assist the student to achieve the goal" (as claimed in claim 5 and correspondingly in claim 14) and "instantiating a component from the table of components to simulate a business application" (as claimed in claim 6 and correspondingly in claim 15). For example, regarding claim 5, Farley teaches (Column 28, lines 1-9. Emphasis added.):

In summary, the Administrative Component establishes users, qualifier, Challenger responses and maintains Challenger session activity, all with the use of easy table selection and updating techniques.

Farley merely teaches a component (i.e., the Administrative Component) utilizing tables and does not even suggest the feature of "instantiating a component from the table of components to evaluate options and present appropriate feedback to assist the student to achieve the goal." Similarly, the combination of Cook and Farley does not even suggest the features of "instantiating a component from the table of components to interact with the student utilizing rule-based logic" (as claimed in claim 8 and correspondingly in claim 17) and "instantiating a component from the table of components to present a time based simulation" (as claimed in claim 9 and correspondingly in claim 18). Neither Cook, nor Farley, nor the combination suggests any of the above features from a table of components.

Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by the Office Action as allegedly being obvious over Cook in view of Farley and U.S. 5,727,161 (Purcell). Claim 7 and 16 ultimately depend from claims 1 and 10. However, Purcell does not make up for the deficiencies of Cook and Farley. The Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 7 and 16.

Amendment Dated April 18, 2005  
Response to Office Action dated January 19, 2005


Application No 09/868,695

### CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 18, 2005

  
Kenneth F. Smolik  
Registration No. 44,344  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 1000  
Chicago, IL 60606-7407  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001